UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,856	10/12/2005	Ronald W. McGehee	16-946	2510
	7590 01/12/201 NDHEIM, COVELL &	EXAMINER		
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700			SELF, SHELLEY M	
CLEVEVLAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3725	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/552,856	MCGEHEE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	enelley cell	0720
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 14 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	, on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3.   ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed).	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They have not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ol>	·	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-15 and 21-25. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/Shelley Self/	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 3725

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment adds several limitations that were not presented for consideration prior to the Final Rejection. For example the proposed amendment adds the limitation(s), "the means for determining in -piece gap reduction being operatively coupled to the processing machine and configured to receive workpiece data corresponding to attributes of the succesive workpieces from said workpiece interrogatoer, to determine an optimized planing solution for each of the successive workpieces, and to send control instructions to said means for setting the size of the gaps between succesive workpieces". This limitation would require further search and consideration. Additionally the claims contain 35 U.S.C 112, 2nd paragraph issues, for example, it is not clear how an optimized planing solution is determined when there is neither a planer nor a planing operation positively recited. Additionally the Terminal Disclaimer (TD) filed December 14,2009 is disapproved because the TD fails to state or incllude a "provision that any patent granted on that application or any patent subject to the reexaminaion proceeding shall be enforceable only for and during such period that said patent is commonly owned with the application or patent which formed the basis for the judicially created double patenting" per 37 CFR 1.321( c) (3); further the terms, "legal title" do not include common ownership as to equitable title. Examiner also notes, that no Power or Attorney (POA) has been filed in this case. For the above reasons the proposed After-Final amendment will not be entered and the claims stand finally rejected as noted in the Final Rejection filed October 14, 2009.

\S.S\ Primary Examiner January 7, 2010